

REMARKS

In the Official Action mailed **July 8, 2002**, the Examiner reviewed claims 1-24. Claims 1, 4-5, 7-9, 12-13, 15-17, 20-21 and 23-24 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Maier et al (USPN 5,625,815, hereinafter "Maier") in view of Li et al (USPN 5,428,737, hereinafter "Li"). Claims 2-3, 6, 10-11, 14, 18-19, and 22 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Maier in view of Li, and further in view of Cochrane et al. (USPN 5,987,455, hereinafter "Cochrane")

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

Independent claims 1, 9, and 17 were rejected as being unpatentable over Maier in view of Li. Applicant respectfully points out that Li teaches, "The fundamental goal is to provide a relatively unexperienced relational database user ...to create, modify and execute relational database queries..." (see Li, Col 4, lines 33-38). Therefore, the **user** can create and **modify the query to provide different query results**.

In contrast, the instant invention discloses the **system modifies the query to cause an audit record to be created** (see page 8, lines 13-14). The system automatically modifying the query to cause an audit record to be created is not the same as a user modifying the query to provide different query results. Having the system modify the query is advantageous because the system can create the audit record based on a specified auditing condition and only when auditing is enabled. There is nothing within Maier or Li, either separately or in concert, which would suggest the system should modify the query to cause an audit record to be created.

Accordingly, Applicant has amended independent claims 1, 9, and 17 to clarify that the system **automatically modifies** the query prior to processing the query, so that processing the query **causes an audit record to be created** and

recorded for rows in relational tables that are accessed by the query and that satisfy an auditing condition.

Hence, Applicant respectfully submits that independent claims 1, 9, and 17 as presently amended are in condition for allowance. Applicant also submits that claims 2-8, which depend upon claim 1, claims 10-16, which depend upon claim 9, and claims 18-24, which depend upon claim 17 are for the same reasons in condition for allowance and for reasons of the unique combinations recited in such claims.

Version with markings to show changes made

The claims:

1 1. (Once Amended) A method for selectively auditing accesses to a
2 relational database, comprising:
3 receiving a query for the relational database;
4 automatically modifying the query prior to processing the query, so that
5 processing the query causes an audit record to be created and recorded for rows in
6 relational tables that are accessed by the query and that satisfy an auditing
7 condition;
8 processing the modified query to produce a query result, wherein
9 processing the modified query includes,
10 creating the audit record for rows in relational tables that
11 are accessed by the query and that satisfy the auditing condition,
12 and
13 recording the audit record in an audit record store; and
14 returning the query result.

1 9. (Once Amended) A computer-readable storage medium storing
2 instructions that when executed by a computer cause the computer to perform a
3 method for selectively auditing accesses to a relational database, the method
4 comprising:
5 receiving a query for the relational database;
6 automatically modifying the query prior to processing the query, so that
7 processing the query causes an audit record to be created and recorded for rows in
8 relational tables that are accessed by the query and that satisfy an auditing
9 condition;
10 processing the modified query to produce a query result, wherein
11 processing the modified query includes,

12 creating the audit record for rows in relational tables that
13 are accessed by the query and that satisfy the auditing condition,
14 and
15 recording the audit record in an audit record store; and
16 returning the query result.

1 17. (Once Amended) An apparatus that selectively audits accesses to a
2 relational database, comprising:
3 a receiving mechanism that is configured to receive a query for the
4 relational database;
5 a query modification mechanism that is configured to automatically
6 modify the query, prior to processing the query, so that processing the query
7 causes an audit record to be created and recorded for rows in relational tables that
8 are accessed by the query and that satisfy an auditing condition;
9 a query processor that is configured to process the modified query to
10 produce a query result, wherein processing the modified query includes,
11 creating the audit record for rows in relational tables that are
12 accessed by the query and that satisfy the auditing condition, and
13 recording the audit record in an audit record store; and
14 a returning mechanism that is configured to return the query result.

CONCLUSION

It is submitted that the application is presently in form for allowance. Such action is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

By



Edward J. Grundler
Registration No. 47,615

Date: September 16, 2002

Edward J. Grundler
PARK, VAUGHAN & FLEMING LLP
508 Second Street, Suite 201
Davis, CA 95616-4692
Tel: (530) 759-1663
FAX: (530) 759-1665